REMARKS

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office action mailed April 27, 2005. An amendment was submitted on April 13, 2005 electing Species A, group I for prosecution. Claims 11-21 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-10, and 22-25 were examined and stand rejected. Claim 10 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 10 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

In the Claims

Claim 5

Applicant amends Claim 5 as directed by the Examiner.

Claim 10

Dependent claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 22

Applicant amends Claim 22 so that it now defines the bridge circuit as comprising a resistive bridge circuit. A voltage transformer circuit having, among other things, a resistive bridge circuit is not shown in the prior art.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 has been amended to correct the plurality error of the word "windings."

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 9, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,111 to Yoshida ("Yoshida"). The Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Action cites Yoshida, which is prior art directed to a switching power supply. Specifically, the portion of the power supply circuit cited that allegedly discloses the claimed invention is a rectifier having a number of diodes, a capacitor and an inductive device that rectify the output voltage of a transformer. Typically, a rectifier, like the one shown in Yoshida, converts a current from an unknown or alternating polarity to a direct current of known polarity.

The claimed bridge circuit eliminates the effects of temperature dependence of the impedance of the coils, and therefore the temperature effects on the output voltage. The Yoshida rectifying circuit is not the same or even a similar element as the claimed bridge circuit. The diodes in the Yoshida rectifying circuit may be characterized as synchronous rectifying circuits, which operate in a completely different manner than the claimed bridge circuit to produce a completely different result. Moreover, the capacitor is referred to as a "smoothing capacitor", which in essence lessens the variation in the raw output voltage from the synchronous rectifying circuits. The inductive device coupled to the capacitor assists the smoothing capacitor in this regard, since the combination serves to smooth out the output voltage.

In contrast, the claimed bridge circuit, which is not a similar rectifier as shown in the Yoshida reference, is designed to eliminate the effects of temperature at the output of a transformer by canceling the effects of the coil impedance. Since Yoishida neither teaches nor suggests the claimed bridge circuit, the rejection of independent claims 1 and claims 2-6, 9 that depend from claim 1 under §102(b) relying on Yoshida is improper and should be withdrawn. A prompt issuance of a notice of allowance for claims 1-6, 9 is therefore requested.

Moreover, since Yoishida neither teaches nor suggests a resistive bridge circuit as claimed in amended independent claim 22, the rejection of claim 22 and claim 23 that depends from claim 22 under §102(b) relying on Yoshida is improper and should be withdrawn. A prompt issuance of a notice of allowance for claims 22 and 23 is also requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7, 8, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Yoshida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,060,876 to Glasband ("Glasband"). The Applicant traverses this rejection. For the reasons stated above with respect to independent claims 1 and 22, dependent claims 7, 8, 24 and 25 are allowable as well. In addition, Glasband is concerned with reducing or eliminating EMI and RFI emissions and other interference and noise components ordinarily resulting from the application of conventional ac power to a load. Quite the opposite is true for the present invention. The claimed invention desires that the noise and interference is passed unattenuated, making an accurate waveform containing all the desired harmonic content, and is thereafter measured.

Conclusion

The rejection of claims 1-10, 22-25 is deemed avoided. In turn, all claims should be allowable. Early action and allowance is respectfully requested for all pending claims. If there are questions, the Examiner can reach Applicants' counsel at (303) 866-0544 or by e-mail at ron.gorsche@hro.com.

Please charge any fees not accompanying this communication that may be required to deposit account 08-2665.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald C. Gorsché
Registration No. 45,505
Customer Number 34013
HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP
1700 Lincoln Street, Suite 4100
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: (303) 861-7000

Dated: October 27, 2005